

POLEMIC ISSUES

<u>Critic</u>	<u>Proponent</u>
1. No firm "scientific" experiment has been performed to prove existence of the phenomena.	The extremely personal nature of the phenomena as it is currently perceived requires an intense personal involvement which could easily lead to a circus-type atmosphere for first-hand observation. This is very undesirable, possibly detrimental, and excluded by the human use protocols. *
2. The evidence produced could be the result of trickery or poor experimental design.	We don't think we fooled ourselves with our own challenge/validation session; constantly seeking better experimental procedure within the human use protocols.
3. No explanation exists in terms of scientific theory to support the existence of such phenomena.	Application need not wait for complete scientific understanding.
4. There are not enough resources being currently provided to known areas of science with "hard" proven potential to waste significant resources on an area as "soft" as this.	The potential military applications, of this phenomena, are extremely important and only a few are working on this area.
5. The form of the raw product could, and at times in the past, has been very leading for a non-critical evaluator.	We think that our pre-evaluation editing out of dates and previous session related information from the transcript, along with the ordering of targets plus transcripts as provided to the evaluators, overcomes this.

PROGRAM ISSUES

<u>ISSUE</u>	<u>ACTION</u>
1. Non perfect correspondence of target description to target.	Correspondence $\sim 0.65 \pm 0.15$ for good target descriptions conduct more analyses using principal characteristics of TDS.
2. Target "localization" capability unknown.	Work on DF and Ranging.
3. Frequency of target missing undefined.	Work on miss criteria using existing TDs.
4. Measures of effectiveness undefined.	Develop first cut MOE.
5. Appropriate target classes unknown.	Develop first-cut target selection criteria.